

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-29 are pending in this Application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-19, 21-25, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,327,628 (hereinafter “Anuff”). Claims 5, 15, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff. Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,538,673 (hereinafter “Maslov”).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 102(b)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-19, 21-25, and 27-29 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Anuff.

Applicants respectfully note that to anticipate a pending claim, a prior art reference must provide, either expressly or inherently, each and every limitation of the pending claim. (M.P.E.P. § 2131).

The Office Action alleges that Anuff teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations of claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-19, 21-25, and 27-29. However, based on the arguments presented below, Applicants respectfully submit that Anuff fails to teach or suggest one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-19, 21-25, and 27-29.

A portlet is a web-based page or window that is configured to display data from a data source. (Application: Paragraph [0021]). Accordingly, embodiments of the present invention enable a portlet to be declaratively specified. (Application: Paragraph [0071]). A portlet is then generated from the declarative specifications. A data source may be specified in addition to how to lay out data from the data source. Thus, a user can specify the data to be accessed and displayed, and how to lay it out. Previously, a user would have to write software code for the portlet using a programming language. However, using embodiments of the present invention, a user does not have to write software code. Rather, a user may declaratively specify a portlet. Accordingly, time that a user would have to wait for development to build, test, deploy

a portlet is avoided. Thus, time to market for a portal page is reduced. (Application: Paragraph [0071]).

As discussed above, using embodiments of the present invention, a user does not have to write software code. For example, claim 1 recites the feature of “generating software coding that creates a portlet based on the data source specification and the layout specification.” As recited in claim 1, the data source specification is determined from access information received from a user via a first user interface during an interactive session to create software coding for generating portlets. As further recited in claim 1, the layout specification is determined from layout information received via a second user interface during the interactive session. Therefore, a user does not need to have coding experience, but can have the software coding that creates a portlet generated by using information received from the first and second user interfaces. (Application: Paragraph [0021]).

However, Anuff fails to disclose generating software coding that creates a portlet as recited in claim 1 by simply “editing the content of the individual modules” (Col. 7, lines 5-24 and 59-63) and enabling “the user to revise the layout of the portal, change its color scheme” (Col. 4, lines 6-15) as relied upon in the Office Action to reject the interactive process of as recited in claim 1. In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action alleges that Anuff discloses “generating software coding that represents an object that creates a portal/GUI (i.e., a module)” in at least Col. 7, lines 5-24 and Col. 13, lines 53-65. However, in these sections, Anuff merely suggests that each module (allegedly corresponding to the software coding of claim 1) generates HTML (e.g., allegedly corresponding to the portlet created by the software coding of claim 1). In Anuff, a module is software that generates HTML that can be rendered in a user’s browser. (Anuff: Col. 14, lines 3-9). The Office Action recognizes that a user in Anuff can customize from where a particular modules obtains data and how that data will be displayed (i.e., layout). Thus, the users in Anuff can customize how a module generates HTML, but Anuff does not disclose that a user can generate the module as recited in claim 1.

Anuff fails to disclose that the user is actually creating the modules by specifying the data source and the layout of the data as software coding that creates a portlet is generated as

recited in claim 1. In Anuff, these are merely parameters used by the display logic of each module in Anuff to generate the HTML to be rendered by a browser. Accordingly, there is a difference between customizing the HTML generated by a module of Anuff and actually creating the modules of Anuff that generated the HTML as recited in claim 1 where software coding that creates a portlet is generated.

The Office Action alleges that Anuff includes a “front end” user interface and a backend “administration user interface.” On page 8, the Office Action acknowledges that the “front end” of Anuff is used to “customize access to a plurality of different content sources as well as customize the layout and style of said data sources.” The Office Action further alleges that the “code/rendering of said portlets being directly adjusted to meet the selections of the user.” Again, Anuff merely suggests that the rendering of the HTML generated by the modules is being adjusted in that the HTML generated by a given module can be customized. However, adjusting the HTML output by a module in Anuff again is different from adjusting the coding of the module itself or actually generating the software for the module as the process recited in claim 1. Thus, the information received from the “front end” interface of Anuff is used to adjust the HTML output of a module, and thus Anuff does not disclose using the “front end” to specify information for generating the modules of Anuff as recited in the feature of “generating software coding that creates a portlet based on the data source specification and the layout specification” of claim 1.

The Office Action further refers to the backend “administration user interface,” but merely alleges that the interface has the ability to control the software coding at a higher level. Anuff does not disclose that the administrator can use one or more interfaces as recited in claim 1 to generate or create the modules of Anuff.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Anuff fails to disclose generating software coding that creates a portlet as recited in claim 1. Anuff fails to disclose generating software coding (e.g., the modules of Anuff) that creates a portlet (e.g., the HTML generated by a given module of Anuff; a portlet is a web-based page or window that is

configured to display data from a data source - Application: Paragraph [0021]) based on a data source specification and a layout specification specified by a user as recited in claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 11 and 22 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and others.

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-10, 12-21, and 23-29 that depend directly and/or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 11, and 22 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims.

Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Appl. No. 10/676,829
Amdt. dated December 1, 2008
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2178

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:lls
61598284 v1